



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/241,515 02/01/99 YANIV

Z 3250-627

KENNETH M. MASSARONI
3424 CHASELTON COURT
BERKELEY LAKE GA 30096

WM01/1003

EXAMINER

PATEL, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2673

DATE MAILED:

10/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/241,515

Applicant(s)

YANIV, ZVI

Examiner

Nitin Patel

Art Unit

2673

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 1999.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-28 and 31-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-28 and 31-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 February 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the flat display, liquid crystal display device, FED, EL, plasma must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 14, 18, 19, 20-21, 28, 31, 32, 35, 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuzawa et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,430).

As per claims 1, 19 Matsuzawa teaches an apparatus for providing a pictorial representation (In Abstract):

Comprising at least one static presentation region for providing at least a first (In fig.3), unchanging rendering and at least one dynamic presentation region adjacent to at least one static region, dynamic presentation region providing at least a first series of changing renderings (In Col. 9 lines 39-67 to Col.10 lines 1-9).

As per claims 2, 3, 20, 21 Matsuzawa teaches plurality of static and dynamic regions (In Fig.3 and In Col.9 lines 50-55).

Art Unit: 2673

As per claim 10, 28 Matsuzawa teaches pictorial representation is an artistic rendering (In col.14 lines 34-44).

As per claim 14, 32 Matsuzawa teaches dynamic presentation is a mechanical structure (In Fig.14 and 15).

As per claim 18, 37 Matsuzawa teaches a memory for storing information to be presented in dynamic presentation region (In Col.14 lines 44-55).

As per claim 35, Matsuzawa teaches a pictorial representation a computer environment (In Fig.1).

As per claim 31, Matsuzawa teaches a static presentation regions may be changed (In col.9 lines 39-67).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-9, 15-17, 22-27, 33-34, 36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuzawa et al., (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,430) in view of Novich (U.S. Patent No. 5,811,926).

As per claims 4-9, 22-27 Matsuzawa does not show an apparatus is a liquid crystal display, flat device display, FED, EL, plasma device and group of reflective devices and combination.

Art Unit: 2673

Novich teaches an apparatus is a liquid crystal display, flat device display, FED, EL, plasma device and group of reflective devices and combination (In Col.1 lines 31-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention was made, to allow different types of display device taught by Novich with the display device of Matsuzawa's because it would have provided a improved image resolution and faster data image transfer.

As per claim 15-17,33-34,36 Matsuzawa does not teach a projected image and a holograph image region apparatus that connected to I/O for coupling. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the user could conform and performed particular dynamic image object before editing the operation so it would have communicated portable and also connected with a computer with a network is well known in the art.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Patel whose telephone number is 703-308-7024. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bipin H Shalwala can be reached on 703-305-4938. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-

Art Unit: 2673

872-9314 for regular communications and 703-308-9052 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-9618.

Nitin Patel
Examiner
Art Unit 2673

NP
September 27, 2001

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Vijay Shankar', written over a horizontal line.

**VIJAY SHANKAR
PRIMARY EXAMINER**